

REMARKS

Claims 2 – 4 and 15 and 16 are currently pending. In the Office Action, all pending claims were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly obvious in view of Hoom et al. (US 6,835,853) (hereinafter, “Hoom”).

Each of the foregoing rejections is respectfully traversed. Favorable reconsideration is requested in view of the above amendments and following remarks.

The Applicants have herein amended Claims 2, 15, and 16 to further specify that the claimed compositions each comprise (R)-tamsulosin hydrochloride (as opposed to racemic tamsulosin hydrochloride) formed from the alkylation of R-5-(2-aminopropyl)-2-methoxybenzenesulphonamide with a molar excess of 1-(2-bromoethoxy)-2-ethoxybenzene. As the Examiner knows, the optically active (R)-enantiomer of tamsulosin HCl is pharmaceutically active.

The subject matter of the claims is contrary to the teachings of the Hoom reference. Hoom discloses a reaction of (2-bromoethoxy)-2-ethoxybenzene with a 5-(2-aminopropyl)-2-methoxybenzenesulphonamide at Column 14 and in Example 2A. In both instances, however, Hoom starts with a *racemic* amine composition. This is not optically active. *See, e.g.*, Column 14, line 20. Accordingly, the end product of Hoom’s reaction is not (R)-tamsulosin hydrochloride, but is instead a racemic tamsulosin hydrochloride composition. This is explicitly stated in Example 2A.

Thus, the reaction mixtures described in Hoom are substantially different from those recited in the current claims – a significant portion of the reaction product in Hoom would be the undesired (S)-enantiomer of tamsulosin rather than the pharmaceutically active (R)-enantiomer. The reaction mixtures described in Hoom will have to be further processed to separate the (R)- and (S)-enantiomers. The present invention obviates the need for such a step. Given these differences, Hoom cannot fairly be said to describe or suggest the presently claimed invention.

In light of the foregoing, the present amendment is believed to place the application in a condition for allowance and entry of the foregoing amendments and allowance of the claims is respectfully solicited.

U.S. Application No. 10/584,651
August 30, 2010

In the event that this response is not timely filed, Applicants hereby petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fee for this extension, along with any other fees which may be due with respect to this response, may be charged to our Deposit Account No. 12-2355.

Respectfully submitted,

LUEDEKA, NEELY & GRAHAM, P.C.

By: /Mark S. Graham/

Mark S. Graham

Registration No. 32,355

Date: August 30, 2010

Luedeka, Neely & Graham, P.C.
P.O. Box 1871
Knoxville, Tennessee 37901
(865) 546-4305

E-Filing